



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/721,002

11/24/2003

Jean-Emile Elien

MSFT-2752/302033

5648

41505

7590

11/21/2006

WOODCOCK WASHBURN LLP (MICROSOFT CORPORATION)  
CIRA CENTRE, 12TH FLOOR  
2929 ARCH STREET  
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19104-2891

EXAMINER

CAO, PHUONG THAO

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 11/21/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/721,002	<b>Applicant(s)</b> ELIEN ET AL.	
	<b>Examiner</b> Phuong-Thao Cao	<b>Art Unit</b> 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 August 2006.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is in response to Amendment filed on 8/21/2006.
2. Claims 1, 13 and 21 have been amended. Currently, claims 1-21 are pending.

### *Response to Arguments*

3. Applicant's arguments filed on 8/21/2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Zou et al. does not disclose or suggest at least providing a single unified user interface to all adaptors, Zou et al. teaches a Web interface of the service search engine (see [page 8, column 2]) which allows users to search for software services wherein each software service represents an adapter and the Web interface can be considered as a single unified user interface to all adaptors as illustrated in Applicant's claim language. The interface taught in the second full paragraph on page 5 is an application interface not a user interface.

Regarding Applicant's argument that Zou et al. does not teach "an automated discovery of service description", Zou et al. teaches a CORBA object wrapper (see [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3]) acting as an interface adapter which can be applied to make the necessary functionality of a legacy service available to remote clients by automatically registering its

description into a service repository wherein the automatically registering its description can be interpreted as automated discovery of service description as in Applicant's claim language.

### *Specification*

4. The specification is objected to because the specification pg. 3 [0014] should have the words "Prior Art" stated for FIG. 2.

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Zou et al. ("Web-Based Specification and Integration of Legacy Services", IBM Press: 2000).

As to claim 1, Zou et al. teach:

"A computer-implemented system for providing a standardized adapter framework" (see Abstract and [page 3, column 2, paragraph 2-3]), comprising:

“a configuration user interface module for receiving a configuration schema describing configuration information, wherein the configuration user interface module display a single unified user interface for interfacing with any adaptor” (see [page 8, column 2] for the disclosure of Web interface of the service search engine designed to receiving a search specification wherein interface of the search specifications can be considered as a configuration schema that describes the configuration of a search query; and a Web interface of the service search engine which allows users to search for software services wherein each software service represents an adapter and the Web interface can be considered as a single unified user interface to all adaptors as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language);

“a metadata utility for automated discovery of service descriptions, the metadata utility receiving at least one metadata file providing data interface information and service description information” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein the service management module is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata utility”, “description information in XML form” is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata file”, and the automated receiving by the service management module the description information in XML form automatically send from object wrapper [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3] is equivalent to Applicant’s “automated discovery of service descriptions”); and

“generating from the configuration schema and the metadata file a configuration file and a service selection file required by an adaptor to connect to an application” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 2] and [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein service description or XML encoded service interface description is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration file”, “table to index the service ID and the corresponding XML service description” is equivalent to

Art Unit: 2164

Applicant's "service selection file", and the service description is used to access to a software service [page 8, column 1, paragraph 3]; also see [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3] and [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2-4]).

As to claim 2, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

"wherein the configuration schema comprises a XML schema" (see [page 2, column 2, paragraph 2], [page 5, column 2, paragraph 1] and Fig. 4).

As to claim 3, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

"wherein the at least one metadata file comprises a WSDL file" (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein service description information in XML form is equivalent to WSDL file since WSDL is defined as an XML format to describe network services; also see [page 5, column 1, paragraph 1] and Fig. 4).

As to claim 4, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one metadata file comprises an XML schema” ([page 9, column 2, paragraph 4] and Fig. 11 wherein XML interface representation is equivalent to Applicant’s “metadata file comprises an XML schema”; also see Fig. 6).

As to claim 5, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising a data store for storing the configuration file” (see [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein “XML encoded service interface description” or “XML document” is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration file” and database is equivalent to Applicant’s “data store”).

As to claim 6, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising a data store for storing the service selection file” (see [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2 wherein database is equivalent to Applicant’s “data store” and “table to index the service ID and the corresponding XML service description” is equivalent to Applicant’s “service selection file”).

As to claim 7, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the configuration file is an XML file” (see [page 2, column 2, paragraph 2] and [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein XML document including configuration information [page 6, column 1, paragraph 1] is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration file”).

As to claim 8, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein a unified user interface is generated from the configuration schema and the at least one metadata file” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein available facts and the DTD of each fact as disclosed [also see page 5] equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration schema and the at least one metadata file”).

As to claim 9, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein information entered via the unified user interface is stored in the configuration file” (see [page 7] wherein the service description is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration file” since it configures how to access to services, and the disclosure of the service description generated automatically from the information provided by the user is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).



As to claim 10, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 8 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein information entered via the unified user interface is stored in the service selection file” (see [page 7] wherein “table to index the service ID and corresponding XML service description” is equivalent to Applicant’s “the service selection file”, and the disclosure of inserting service description generated from user input into the index table is equivalent to Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 11, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 2 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the XML schema is received from the adaptor associated with the configuration file” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein “description information in XML form” is equivalent to Applicant’s “XML schema” and see [page 4, column 3, paragraph 3] wherein CORBA object wrapper is equivalent to Applicant’s “adaptor”).

As to claim 12, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 1 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the at least one metadata file is received from the adaptor associated with the configuration file” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] and [column 10, column 1, paragraph 1]

wherein description information in XML form including self-description information (metadata) is equivalent to Applicant's "metadata file").

As to claim 13, Zou et al. teach:

"A method for providing a standardized adaptor framework" (see Abstract, [page 3, column 2, paragraph 3] and [page 7, column 2, paragraph 2-3]), comprising:

"receiving a description of configuration data associated with an adaptor via automated discovery of service descriptions" (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein description information is equivalent to Applicant's "description of configuration data", and see [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein each CORBA object wrapper is equivalent to Applicant's "adaptor", and the automated receiving by the service management module the description information in XML form automatically send from object wrapper [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3] is equivalent to Applicant's "automated discovery of service descriptions");

"generating an adapter-specific user interface from the configuration data description, wherein the adaptor-specific user interface is displayed as a single unified user interface for interface with any adaptor" (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein the user interface generated dynamically according to available facts and the DTD of each fact is equivalent to Applicant's "adapter-specific user interface" and the DTD of each fact [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2] is equivalent to Applicant's "configuration data description"; also see [page 8, column 2] for the teaching of a Web interface of the service search engine which allows users to search for software services wherein each software service represents an adapter and the Web

interface can be considered as a single unified user interface to all adaptors as illustrated in Applicant's claim language);

“receiving instance-specific data from the adaptor-specific user interface” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein selecting required facts from the interface implies the receiving of information relating to those facts as illustrated in Applicant's claim language); and

“saving the instance-specific data and the description of configuration data in an XML file” (see [page 6, column 1, paragraph 1] and [page 7, column 1-2] wherein description facts is equivalent to Applicant's “instance-specific data”, XML encoded service interface description or the whole XML document including independent facts as disclosed is equivalent to Applicant's “XML file”, and the disclosure of the ability to insert a new service description and interface to accept user input of description facts implies the saving of data as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

As to claim 14, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“saving the XML file in a data store” (see [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein XML encoded service interface description is equivalent to Applicant's “XML file” and database is equivalent to Applicant's “data store”).

As to claim 15, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the description of configuration data is an XML schema” (see Fig. 4 and [page 5]).

As to claim 16, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising receiving information associated with data interface and service description” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] for the disclosure of the service management module receiving description information in XML form which includes interface information and service description of a software component as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language).

As to claim 17, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 16 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“wherein the information associated with data interface and service description is a WSDL specification” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein service description information in XML form is equivalent to WSDL specification since WSDL is defined as an XML format to describe network services; also see [page 5, column 1, paragraph 1] and Fig. 4).

As to claim 18, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 13 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising receiving a message associated with an application request” (see [page 4, column 1, paragraph 3] wherein request for a servlet is equivalent to Applicant’s “message associated with an application request”).

As to claim 19, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 14 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising receiving a message associated with an application request and selecting an XML file from the data store, the XML file associated with the application request” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 3-4] and [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2-3] wherein service request is equivalent to Applicant’s “message associated with an applicant’s request”, and XML document must be selected from service repository to localize requested service as disclosed in [page 8, column 1, paragraph 3]).

As to claim 20, this claim is rejected based on arguments given above for rejected claim 19 and is similarly rejected including the following:

Zou et al. teach:

“further comprising sending the XML file to the adaptor” [page 13, column 2, paragraph 1] wherein script encoded in XML is equivalent to Applicant’s “XML file” and this script must be sent to the adaptor of the service to invoke the service; also see [page 3, column 2, paragraph 3]).

As to claim 21, Zou et al. teach:

“A computer storage medium comprising computer-executable instructions” (see Abstract) for:

“receiving a description of configuration data associated with an adaptor via automated discovery of service descriptions” (see [page 9, column 1, paragraph 2] wherein description information is equivalent to Applicant’s “description of configuration data”, and see [page 4, column 3, paragraph 3] wherein CORBA object wrapper is equivalent to Applicant’s “adaptor”, and the automated receiving by the service management module the description information in XML form automatically send from object wrapper [page 4, column 2, paragraph 3] is equivalent to Applicant’s “automated discovery of service descriptions”);

“generating an adapter-specific property page from the configuration data description” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] and [page 5] wherein the user interface generated dynamically according to available facts and the DTD of each fact is equivalent to Applicant’s “adapter-specific property page” and the DTD of each fact [page 7, column 1, paragraph 2] is equivalent to Applicant’s “configuration data description”);

“receiving instance-specific data from the property page” (see [page 7, column 2, paragraph 3] wherein Web interface is equivalent to Applicant’s “property page” and selecting required facts from the interface implies the receiving those information as illustrated in Applicant’s claim language); and

“displaying a single unified user interface for interfacing with any adaptor” (see [page 8, column 2] for the teaching of a Web interface of the service search engine which allows users to search for software services wherein each software service represents an adaptor and the Web

Art Unit: 2164

interface can be considered as a single unified user interface to all adaptors as illustrated in Applicant's claim language).

*Conclusion*

7. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Phuong-Thao Cao whose telephone number is (571) 272-2735. The examiner can normally be reached on 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM (Mon - Fri).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on (571) 272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.



Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PTC

November 2, 2006

  
**CHARLES RONES**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**